# USAID – IP Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Template – Version: November 26, 2014

| Sections | Contents | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| **Cover** | · Standard USAID Front Cover/Format<br>· Project Name<br>· Activity Approved Date<br>· Contract End Date<br>· Name of Implementing Partner<br>· Contract/Agreement Number<br>· Names of Sub-contractors/Sub-awardees<br>· Version – Draft or Final<br>· Date<br>· Disclaimer<br>· Acronyms<br>· Table of Contents | |
| | | |
| **Project Overview** | · Brief Description of the project's purpose<br>· Brief Description of the project's development hypothesis<br>· Results Framework Chart or logical framework showing the causal and logical relationships between different levels of results and their associated indicators<br>· Narrative highlighting in sufficient detail causal linkages at each level and clear relationships between the activity-level results (outputs) and the higher-level results (outcomes) of the project<br>· Explanation of critical assumptions<br>· Brief Description of how data will be used to assess progress<br>· Explanation of any substantive changes from initial M&E plan | Per ADS 203.3.5, the IP M&E plan should:<br>· include performance indicators that are consistent with and meet the data collection needs of the Mission's Performance Management Plan (PMP);<br>· include additional indicators that the Mission needs for activity management;<br>· not include every indicator that the implementing partner will use for its own management purposes.<br><br>It is especially important that there is a development hypothesis or theory of change to understand not only what is behind the purpose (why the project was created) but why the implementers chose to implement it in this way. This information is necessary for understanding the Results Framework and M&E Plan.<br><br>The graphic presentation of the results framework (the activity's causality) should show a clear relationship among the levels of the objectives in the Results Framework. Indicators should be shown at each level of results, i.e. IR, sub-IR, or output, etc. |
| | | |
| **Relationship to Mission CDCS and PMP** | · Brief Description how results contribute to the Mission strategy<br>· Indicate how M&E plan contributes to Mission's PMP, and include a simple table that aligns project reporting indicators to USAID PMP indicators when the project reports directly against PMP indicators | The activity and its intended results should be easily understood within the larger Mission PMP. Thus the activity (project) should be analyzed in the context of the DO, IR and Sub-IR (where applicable) levels of the Mission PMP. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways including comparing objectives between the IP M&E plan and the Mission's PMP, or from a direct mapping between the IR language and /or numbering system of the IP framework and the PMP. |
| | | |
| **Indicators** | · Table A: Performance Indicators Table w/Definition, Type (e.g., USAID standard indicator, output, outcome), Unit of Measure, Source, Frequency of Collection/Reporting, (should be on PIRs – might be unwieldy in a table)<br>· Table B; Performance Reporting Table, including objectives, indicators, baseline, targets and actuals<br>· Narrative of the reasonableness/feasibility given time, resources, and conditions, and risks to full realization of required achievements.<br>· Table/narrative of Cross-Cutting Issues including Gender and Sustainability of Achievements | Indicators are required for each of the project's objectives/activities. Guidance suggests approximately three indicators per activity – but the number of indicators should be sufficient to determine the <u>achievement</u> of the indicator.<br><br>The specific indicator language is critical to ensure that the indicators – as currently worded – actually measure the results with which they are associated.<br><br>Each indicator should directly link to its result. An indicator should not measure multiple things (school buildings AND students), measure directions ("Increase" is a Result, "Number of" is an indicator), and must have a number ("good test results" or "better economic context" is not an indicator). Indicators should also be worded as specifically as possible using unambiguous terms ("achieved" is better than "addressed").<br><br>All indicator language for a required indicator should exactly match the wording of the USAID indicator. In addition, the PIRS for these indicators should include more precise information on the specific project activities that fall under the more general definitions of the USAID-generated PIRS.<br><br>There are many different types and potential sources of required USAID indicators: these should be included as relevant to the specific project/Mission intent.<br>  a. USAID Gender Mandatory indicators<br>  b. M-PMP indicators from the relevant DO |

|  |  |  |
|---|---|---|
|  |  | c. M-PMP indicators that crosscut<br>d. M-PPR indicators from current approved list<br>e. Other indicators that may be in award document<br>f. Other indicators that USAID needs for activity management<br><br>When completed or finalized, all indicators must have baselines and targets. In draft or initial forms, some – but not most – indicators may have values of "TBD" but plans for how to obtain or produce these values should be identified. Note that for many indicators - particularly project outputs such as # trained - the baseline will, by definition, be zero as the project will not have trained anyone yet. Many target values are set in the RFP or in the proposal and final contract and represent what the project has contracted to achieve.<br><br>Note that actual setting of plausible and reasonable targets is difficult. Deciding what is the required amount of many indicators to achieve higher-level change requires extensive local experience and technical understanding of the intervention and development hypotheses. Target setting must be plausible and achievable. |
|  |  |  |
| **Data Quality** | · Description of data sources and data quality assessment (DQA) systems, procedures, tools and collection methodology<br>· Description of M&E Plan personnel and responsibilities<br>· GIS Plan - Definition of "where" for M&E and GIS considerations (if applicable and required) | In terms of data sources, systems procedures and tools, and collection methodology the M&E plan should describe how data quality will be assured as to:<br>VALIDITY: The data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result<br>INTEGRITY: The data should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation<br>PRECISION: The data should have a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision-making<br>RELIABILITY: The data should reflect stable and consistent collection processes and analysis methods over time<br>TIMELINESS: Data should be available at a useful frequency, be current, and timely enough to influence management decision-making<br><br>The M&E plan should identify the staff members (prime and partners) who will be working on M&E tasks, including one or more staff members designated as the M&E Director, M&E Manager, or similar. Reporting and delegation responsibilities should be outlined.<br><br>Where appropriate, the activity should include one or more indicators with a geographic identification (national, district, project area). In addition, USAID increasingly desires or requires mapping and data visualization. The M&E plan should include a description of what geographic information is being collected by the project's M&E systems so that USAID can assess if required information will be available for Mission need. Geographic identifications should match official government definitions and naming conventions and match requirements of any Mission MIS/GIS. |
|  |  |  |
| **Reporting Schedule** | · Table of Reports Schedule | The schedule of reports as contractually obligated (quarterly and annual reports, etc.) should be included for quick review. As well, the reporting period proposed by the M&E plan should match the Mission's M&E calendar such that reports from the activity will contribute to the Mission's higher-level performance management.<br><br>Of particular importance are the Mission needs for PPR or other reporting to Washington. It is important that the reporting schedule will allow the AOR/COR to have time to review, verify, collate, calculate or otherwise handle the data so that it can contribute to DO or Mission PMP reporting. |
|  |  |  |
| **Annexes** | · Annex A: Project Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)<br>· Annex B: Data Collection Form<br>· Annex C: Data Tools | Annex A: Are the PIRS complete? Is the information in the PIRS plausible<br>Is the information in the PIRS correct? |

| | | For required USAID indicators, does the activity PIRS match the USAID-developed one in key areas? Annex B: The collection process and/or forms to be used. Annex C: Samples of any specific tools/survey instruments proposed to be used. |
|---|---|---|